

REMARKS

Claims 1-6 remain pending in this response with claims 7-11 and 13 being cancelled by this response. Claim 12 was cancelled in a previous response. Additionally, Figure 6 is cancelled by this response. Therefore, any reference made in the specification with respect to Figure 6 is removed. Applicants respectfully submit that no new matter is being added by these amendments.

Applicant wishes to thank Examiner Tran for the courtesy extended in the telephonic conversation on September 1, 2009. During this conversation, it was discussed that claims 7-11 and 13 and Figure 6 will be cancelled. Support for the addition of text and Figure 5 made by the prior response was also discussed.

Objection under 35 U.S.C. 132(a)

Figures 5 and 6 are objected to under 35 U.S.C. 132(a) for introducing new matter into the disclosure. Figure 6 is cancelled by this response. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that in view of the cancellation of Figure 6, the objection to Figure 6 is considered moot and should be withdrawn.

Further, Applicants respectfully submit that Figure 5 is fully supported by originally filed claim 1. The steps identified by reference numerals 510, 520, 545, 547, 565 and 567 correlate directly with specific steps of claim 1. Decision box 530 querying whether a pixel is of a preferred color is supported by the encoding steps of claim 1. The first encoding step supports the Y branch extending from box 530 indicating the pixel is of the preferred color and the second encoding step supports the N branch extending from box 530 indicating the pixel is of another than the preferred color.

The decision box 540 querying whether the Run_length is greater than the defined range contains both a Y and an N branch. The Y branch of decision box 540 yields block 547. This is supported by claim 1 which recites that the Run_length value exceeding the defined range has three bytes. The N branch of decision box 540 yields block 545. It is inherent in claim 1 that if the first code words are encoded with three bytes when the Run_length exceeds the defined range in block 547, then the first code words are encoded with two bytes when Run_length is less than the defined range, as in the N branch of decision block 540 yielding block 545.

The decision block 550 querying whether the Run_length is equivalent to one contains both a Y and an N branch. Claim 1 provides for encoding the second code words with one, three or four bytes. The second code words encoded with three or four bytes comprise a Run_length value. It is thus inherent that if the Run_length equals one, the second code word should be encoded with one byte, following the Y branch of decision block 550. If the Run_length value is not equivalent to one, branch N of decision block 550 is followed.

If the Run_length is not equal to one, decision block 560 queries whether the Run_length is greater than the defined range and contains both a Y and an N branch. Claim 1 recites that a Run_length value, in second code words having four bytes, exceeds the defined range. This claimed feature supports the Y branch of decision box 560 which yields box 565 stating the second code words are encoded with four bytes with Run_length value and color value when Run_length is greater than the defined range. It is inherent in claim 1 that, if the Run_length value is not greater than the defined range, the second code words are encoded with three bytes with Run_length value and color value, as in box 567 following the N branch of box 560.

In view of original claim 1 and the above remarks, it is respectfully submitted that Figure 5 is fully supported in this application. Consequently, it is respectfully submitted that this objection is satisfied and should be withdrawn.

Objection to the Drawings

The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a) as not showing every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Claims 7-11 and 13 are cancelled by this response. Further, Figure 6 is cancelled by this response. Therefore, in view of the cancellation of the claims and figure, it is respectfully submitted that the objection to the drawings are considered moot and should be withdrawn.

Rejection of Claims 7-11 and 13 under 35 U.S.C. § 101

Claims 7-11 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 for being directed towards non-statutory subject matter. Claims 7-11 and 13 are cancelled by this response. Therefore, in view of the cancellation of claims 7-11 and 13, it is respectfully submitted that this rejection is considered moot and should be withdrawn.

Having fully addressed the Examiner's rejections, it is believed that, in view of the preceding amendments and remarks, this application stands in condition for allowance. Accordingly then, reconsideration and allowance are respectfully solicited. If, however, the Examiner is of the opinion that such action cannot be taken, the Examiner is invited to contact the applicant's attorney at the phone number below, so that a mutually convenient date and time for a telephonic interview may be scheduled.

No fee is believed due. However, if a fee is due, please charge the additional fee to Deposit Account 07-0832.

Respectfully submitted,
Dirk Gandolph et al.

By: 

Jack Schwartz
Reg. No. 34,721
Tel. No. (609) 734-6866

Thomson Licensing, LLC.
Patent Operations
PO Box 5312
Princeton, NJ 08543-5312
September 3, 2009